

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
GREENBELT DIVISION**

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
FEB 26 P 2:12

CLERK'S OFFICE
AT GREENBELT

BY *RC* DEPUTY

Jeffery R. Sedgwick
9306 Hilltop Court
Laurel, Maryland 20708

Plaintiff.

vs.

EVANS LAW ASSOCIATES, P.C.
3842 Harlem Road #400-329
Cheektowaga, New York 14245

Defendant

CASE NO. **AW 13 CV 0612**

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED

JUDICIAL NOTICE


All officers of the court for the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida are hereby placed on notice under authority of the supremacy and equal protection clauses of the United States Constitution and the common law authorities of *Haines v Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, *Platsky v. C.I.A.* 953 F.2d. 25, and *Anastasoff v. United States*, 223 F.3d 898 (8th Cir. 2000) relying on *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 503 U.S. 131, 135 (1992), "*United States v. International Business Machines Corp.*, 517 U.S. 843, 856 (1996), quoting *Payne v. Tennessee*, 501 U.S. 808, 842 (1991) (Souter, J., concurring). *Trinsey v. Pagliaro*, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647, *American Red Cross v. Community Blood Center of the Ozarks*, 257 F.3d 859 (8th Cir. 07/25/2001).

In re *Haines*: pro se litigants (Plaintiff is a pro se litigant) are held to less stringent pleading standards than BAR registered attorneys. Regardless of the deficiencies in their pleadings, pro se

litigants are entitled to the opportunity to submit evidence in support of their claims. In re Platsky: court errs if court dismisses the pro se litigant (Plaintiff is a pro se litigant) without instruction of how pleadings are deficient and how to repair pleadings. In re Anastasoff: litigants' constitutional rights are violated when courts depart from precedent where parties are similarly situated. All litigants have a constitutional right to have their claims adjudicated according the rule of precedent. See Anastasoff v. United States, 223 F.3d 898 (8th Cir. 2000). Statements of counsel, in their briefs or their arguments are not sufficient for a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment, Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647.

Dated February 26, 2013

Respectfully Submitted,



Jeffery R. Sedgwick
9306 Hilltop Court
Laurel, Maryland 20708
301-604-2156
vze2snju@verizon.net